DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 125 686 JC 760 361

AUTHOR	Bers, Trudy H.
TITLE	Faculty and Administration Goals: A Comparison Between Oakton Community College and Other Institutions.
INSTITUTION	Oakton Community Coll., Morton Grove, Ill.
PUB DATE	Jun 75
NOTE	32p.; Some tables may reproduce poorly
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrator Attitudes; College Environment; College Faculty; *College Role; Community Colleges; *Educational Objectives; Educational Philosophy; *Junior Colleges; *Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS	IGI; *Institutional Goals Inventory; Oakton Community College

ABSTRACT

The Institutional Goals Inventory (IGI) was administered to full-time faculty and administrators at Oakton Community College (OCC) in fall 1974. In order to determine whether or not OCC responses were similar to responses obtained at other public community colleges, OCC faculty and administrator responses on 17 goal areas in the IGI were compared to the responses on those 17 areas by faculty and administrators at six other community colleges nationwide. Results indicated that the OCC administrators differed significantly from the other administrators on only 10.8% of the items. OCC faculty members differed significantly from other faculty on 53.2% of the total goal areas measured; however, 80.2% of those differences were found in the scale which measures what is perceived as currently important at their respective institutions. Thus, the OCC faculty may be considered fairly different from the other faculties surveyed regarding their perceptions of what "is important" at their schools, but the OCC faculty and the faculties at each of the other institutions were basically in agreement regarding the goals which "should be important." The OCC administrators and the administrators at the other schools were basically in agreement regarding the goals as they perceived them to be at present and as they should be. (Author/DC)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED125686

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATION GOALS:

A COMPARISON BETWEEN OAKTON COMMUNITY COLLEGE AND OTHER INSTITUTIONS

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Submitted by Trudy H. Bers, Ph.D.
June, 1975

JC 760 361

ABSTRACT

This study compares the faculty and administration of Oakton Community College with the faculty and administration at each of six community colleges and community college systems.

THe first set of comparisons done was between the Oakton faculty and the faculty at each of the other institutions and between the Oakton administration and the administration at each of the other schools. It was found that the Oakton faculty was significantly different from the other faculties on 53.2% of the total number of goal areas measured. Of these differences, most (80.2%)occurred in measuring what is perceived as important at the institution currently. The comparison of administrations showed that the OCC administration differed significantly from other administrations on only 10.8% of the total goal areas. Thus the OCC faculty may be considered fairly different from the other faculties surveyed regarding their perceptions of what is important currently at their respective schools, but the OCC faculty and the faculties at each of the other institutions are basically in agreement regarding the goals they believe should be important. The OCC administration and the administrations of the other schools are basically in agreement both regarding goals as they perceive them to be at present and as they should be.

A second set of comparisons examined the rank order of priorities attached to each goal area by the faculty and administration at each school. It was found that institutions were basically similar in their order of priorities, although only Oakton's faculty placed Individual Personal Develorment at the top of their "is important" scale.

Finally, a third set of comparisons examined whether being a faculty member at Oakton was significantly related to a partcular score on a goal area and whether administration membership was significantly

related to a particular score. It was determined that knowing whether an individual was an administration or faculty member at Oakton would not help one predict how that person would perceive goals currently important or what goals should be important. Except for the California system, none of the institutions surveyed showed much faculty-administration divergence on goal areas.

FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATION GOALS:

A COMPARISON BETWEEN OAKTON COMMUNITY COLLEGE AND OTHER INSTITUTIONS

Organizations of all kinds have goals. Often at least some of these goals are implicit and informal, and in many cases they are neither obvious nor discussed. Beyond the manifest objective of educating students--and what "to educate" means is open to debate--educational institutions have a variety of goals. For public community colleges some goals are established by state statutes and federal funding requirements. Others are derived from the components of the schools themselves: faculty, administration, boards, students, staffs, and the community which the school serves. Individuals may refer to the institution's philosophy and goals; generally, however, the determination of these goals and the assumption that they do in fact exist is subjective. Except for general statements in college publications and policy statements there is little empirical data to test whether in fact the components of an institution perceive the same goals and agree with them.

As a method of assessing perceived objectives in educational institutions, the Educational Testing Service has developed a 90 item questionnaire, the Institutional Goals Inventory (IGI). Individual institutions can add up to twenty additional questions of their own. Eighty of the IGI questions are grouped into twenty goal areas of four questions each (see Appendices A and B). Data from the IGI is provided in the form of means and standard deviations for individual questions and goal areas, and a school can have up to five constituent units (e.g., faculty, administration, students)

The author would especially like to thank Mr. James Brod and Dr. Thomas Smithson, without those computer programming statistical advice this study would not have been possible.

independently analyzed, as well as the entire responding group. Of the twenty goal areas, seventeen are applicable to public community colleges.[1] Respondents answer each question along two dimensions: how important they think the goal at the school is, and how important they think it ought to be.

It may be useful and interesting for an institution to have empirical data about the philosophy and goals perceived by the components of the organization. Needed shifts in priorities, areas requiring greater or lesser efforts and resources, and areas of disagreement among components of the school can be illuminated by the IGI. What the IGI by itself does not do, however, is provide data enabling one institution to compare itself with other similar institutions. It is not uncommon for schools to assume they are somehow different from or similar to other institutions and, indeed, there may be a conscious attempt to make one institution different from or like another. But whether the institutions are in fact different or alike is a very different matter than assuming differences or similarities exist.

In order to determine whether Oakton Community College was similar or different from other public community colleges OCC faculty and administration responses on seventeen goal areas in the IGI were compared to the responses from these two groups at a number of other community colleges. As of August, 1974, fifteen public community colleges or statewide community college systems had completed the IGI. Of these, twelve responded to a letter requesting information about their surveys. Six of these provided data in a form comparable to Oakton's data. Hence the schools compared to OCC cannot in any way be construed as a random sample of community colleges or even a random sample of community colleges which have used the IGI. The California data is from a statewide survey which included 69 separate community colleges, although each individual respondent is treated as the unit of analysis. Hence inferences

can be made only for the California system as a whole, not for any particular school. Differences among specific California institutions disappear with this treatment. Similarly, the Alleghany County Community College data is drawn from three separate campuses with three separate administrations. Again, inter-campus differences within a single system are not apparent. The other four institutions were individual organizations.[2]

Statistical results discussed below should be viewed with some caution in drawing specific inferences about Oakton Community College as compared to the other institutions tested both because of the above reason and since three of the institutions did not provide complete statistical data for the analysis. Specifically, three institutions did not provide standard deviations; hence the Oakton standard deviation was substituted as an estimate for the missing data.[3] Nevertheless, given the absence of studies comparing IGI results among institutions, and the difficulty of assessing the meaning of IGI results at one institution without some guideposts as to how the institution compares to others, it was felt that this analysis was valuable.

The first basis of comparison was that of the Oakton Community College faculty with the faculty of each institution or community college system for which data were available. These and subsequent comparisons do not imply that Oakton is unique simply because significant differences were found. If Hillsborough Community College, for example, were compared to each of the other colleges and college systems it might show a profile not too different from Oakton's. The t-test for determining the significance of differences of means was performed, and results are summarized in Table 1 (and more extensively in Appendix C). Of the total number of comparisons on which differences could occur (190, or the number of institutions and community college systems x the number of response areas for which data were available), significant differences were found in 101, or 53.2% of the comparisons. Examining the data more closely,

it is apparent that most of the differences occur regarding the perception of what are important goals at the schools rather than what should be goals. Only 20 of the 101 cells (19.8%) in which a significant difference exists are in the should be important measurement dimension. And of these, six occur on the Public Service area. Thus the Oakton faculty differs from faculty at the other systems and institutions primarily over how the goals of their institutions are perceived at present. With the exception of the goal area Public Service, on which the Oakton faculty consistently believes less importance should be attached to this goal than do the other faculties, faculties at all of these schools are in basic harmony regarding what the community college should be doing.[4] The absolute scores indicate that on the overwhelming majority of goal areas on which significant differences do occur (92, or 91.1%) the Oakton faculty scores higher (views as more important) the particular set of objectives considered.

The administration at Oakton Community College was compared to the administration at the other systems and colleges, and results of this are summarized in Table 2 (and more extensively in Appendix D). As with the faculty comparisons, the t-test was used to determine whether the OCC administration was significantly different on each goal area from other administrators. Differences were found on 34 (10.8%) of the 190 areas; on only two areas--the importance now perceived for individual personal development and the importance which should be attached to public service--was the Oakton administration different from the administration of every college system and institution tested. On the former area the Oakton administration scores higher than each other administration and on the latter they score lower. Of the 34 differences in Table 2, 25 (73.5%) occurred on measures of what is important. In 19 of the 34 differences (55.9%) the Oakton administration had a higher absolute score

TABLE 1

Number and percent of goal areas on which Oakton Community College faculty differs significantly from faculties at other institutions and college systems surveyed

	Calif. Comm. Colleges	Alleghany County C. C.	Hillsborough Comm. College	Brevard Comm. College	Seattle Comm. College	Beaver County C.C.①	Totals
Is important	15(88%)	15(88%)	12(71%)	15(88%)	15(88%)	9(90%)	81
Should be important	7(41%)	1(6%)	1(6%)	5(29%)	4(24%)	2(20%)	20
Totals	22	16	13	20	19	11	

①Based on 10 goal areas for which data were available

TABLE 2

Number and percent of goal areas on which Oakton Community College administration differs significantly from administrations at other institutions and college systems surveyed

	Calif. Comm. Colleges	Alleghany County C.C.	Hillsborough Comm. College	Brevard Comm. College	Seattle Comm. College	Beaver County C.C.①	Totals
Is important	4(24%)	4(24%)	3(18%)	4(24%)	6(35%)	4(40%)	25
Should be important	2(12%)	2(12%)	1(6%)	1(6%)	2(12%)	1(10%)	9
Totals	6	6	4	5	8	5	

①Based on 10 goal areas for which data were available

than their counterparts in other institutions.

From these data it is apparent that the Oakton Community College faculty differs from the faculty at the other six community colleges and community college systems on more goal areas than the Oakton administration differs from the administrations at these schools. Put another way, on their perceptions of what are and should be the goals of their schools, the Oakton administration is more like the administrations of these other schools than the Oakton faculty is like the other faculties.

The absolute scores attached to goal areas are only one type of data which can be used in assessing the similarities or differences among Oakton and other schools, however. The priority attached to these goal areas may also reveal information about these institutions. The rank order of importance assigned to goal areas by Oakton Community College faculty and the faculty of each of the six other institutions or systems surveyed are listed in Tables 3 and 4, while the same information for administrations is in Tables 5 and 6. These tables indicate that, though the absolute scores given each goal area by the faculty or administration differ, the order of priorities is much the same, although it is interesting that Oakton is the only community college whose faculty placed Individual Personal Development at the top of the "is important" priorities, a reflection of the college's philosophy.

Finally, a third form of data analysis was used to determine the comparisons by goal area between the Oakton faculty-administration differences and the faculty-administration differences at each of the other community college systems and individual institutions for which data were available. Faculty or administration membership was treated as a dichotomous variable, and the mean goal area scores were treated as though they were means of continuously distributed interval scaled variables.[5] Results

of this appear in Table 7. Each cell entry is the point biserial correlation coefficient. Significance is interpreted as meaning that there is a significant correlation between faculty group membership and the goal area score and administration group membership and the goal area score. A positive score which is significant means that being a faculty member is significantly associated with a higher item score (higher relative to not being an administrator and not tending to score lower as administrators would with a positive r_{pb}), and a negative score means that being a faculty member is significantly associated with a lower item score. A significant correlation does not imply predictive value; i.e., being a faculty member or administration member would not be <u>individually</u> predictive of a high or low item score relative to the item score of an administrator unless the r_{pb} were quite large. Further, the total amount of variance explained by faculty or administration membership using this correlation is r_{pb}^2; hence faculty or administration membership would not be very powerful as a predictor variable in a multiple regression equation featuring individual's IGI goal area scores.

Table 7 reveals that on only two items (what should be the importance of the goal areas of Social Criticism/Activism and of Freedom) is being a faculty member at Oakton Community College significantly associated with a higher score than being an administration member, and a negative correlation does not occur at all at a significant level. Indeed, the only institution which demonstrates a sizeable number of significant correlations is the California Community College system, and in every case but one (the importance which should be attached to Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness) being a California faculty member is associated with a lower score than the score of a California administration member. With the exception of California, college systems and institutions did not demonstrate many differences between

faculty scores and administration scores. At least on the goals measured there appears to be little difference in the goal orientations of faculty and administration at each institution. This is not to suggest that they are in agreement with each other regarding policy choices, however. In addition to the disagreement which may exist within a group (a faculty with half scoring 1 and half scoring 5 still has a mean of 3), the policy constraints operating to limit the freedom of choice of faculty and administration might well force them to behave in ways different than their personal preferences might suggest. Role expectations might also limit the freedom of faculty and administration to behave in personally preferred ways. The Institutional Goals Inventory is a philosophical study; measures of actual behavior and achievements are not included in it.[6]

In general, the comparison of the objectives of Oakton Community College faculty and administration with the faculty and administration of other community colleges and community college systems suggests that Oakton is not terribly different from these other institutions except as to how the OCC faculty perceives the importance of goals currently in operation at the school. The OCC faculty does view most goals as being of significantly greater importance at the school than the faculties of the other schools do. The priorities attached to goal areas by administration and faculty and the correlation between faculty or administration membership with a particular mean score (except for California) are not very different at Oakton than at the other institutions.

TABLE 3

RANK ORDER AND MEAN OF GOAL AREA PRIORITIES
BY COLLEGE SYSTEM AND INSTITUTION
FACULTY "IS" IMPORTANT

Rank Order	Oakton Community College	California Community Colleges	Seattle Community College	Beaver County Community College	Brevard Community College	Alleghany County Community College	Hillsborough Community College
1	Ind. Per. Dev. 4.05	Voc. Prep. 3.41	Voc. Prep. 3.50	Voc. Prep. 3.40	Voc. Prep. 3.48	Voc. Prep. 3.29	Voc. Prep. 3.65
2	Freedom 3.85	Meeting Local Needs 3.31	Freedom 3.41	Meeting Local Needs 3.17	Meeting Local Needs 3.27	Freedom 3.20	Innovation 3.47
3	Innovation 3.84	Soc. Egal. 3.23	Soc. Egal. 3.21	Ind. Per.Dev. 2.90	Soc. Egal. 3.18	Soc. Egal. 3.09	Soc. Egal. 3.36
4	Voc. Prep. 3.84	Academic Dev. 3.20	Meeting Local Needs 3.04	Intel. Orient 2.67	Academic Dev. 3.06	Academic Dev. 3.06	Meeting Local Needs 3.26
5	Community 3.57	Freedom; Acc./Effici. 3.18	Ind. Per. Dev. 2.86	Innovation 2.65	Acc./Effici. 3.05	Meeting Local Needs 3.03	Ind. Per. Dev. 3.05
6	Soc. Egal. 3.54	Community 3.09	Acc./Effici. 2.85	Public Service 2.51	Freedom 2.97	Ind. Per.Dev. 2.95	Acc./Effici. 3.04
7	Meeting Local Needs 3.50	Ind. Per.Dev. 3.05	Academic Dev. 2.38	Dem. Gov. 2.49	Innovation 2.95	Acc./Effici. 2.94	Freedom 2.83
8	Dem. Gov. 3.31	Dem. Gov. 2.95	Community 2.78	Community 2.48	Ind. Per. Dev. 2.90	Community 2.77	Public Service 2.81
9	Academic Dev, Acc./Effici. 3.28	Innovation 2.93	Public Service 2.71	Intel./Aesth. Environment 2.46	Intel. Orient. 2.81	Intel. Orient 2.75	Academic Dev. 2.76
10	Intel. Orient 3.27	Intel./Aesth. Environment 2.88	Dem. Gov. 2.70	Hum./Alt. 2.30	Cul./Aesth Awareness 2.80	Innovation 2.67	Intel. Orient. 2.68
11	Intel./Aesth. Environment 3.20	Intel. Orient. 2.87	Innovation 2.67		Public Service; Intel./Aesth. Environment 2.76	Dem. Gov. 2.64	Hum./Alt.; Cul./Aesth. Awareness 2.62
12	Cul./Aesth. Awareness 3.11	Hum./Alt. 2.79	Intel. Orient. 2.58		Community 2.72	Public Service 2.59	Off-Campus Learning 2.56
13	Hum./Alt. 3.01	Cul./Aesth Awareness 2.76	Hum./Alt. 2.57		Dem. Gov. 2.60	Intel./Aesth. Environment 2.55	Intel./Aesth. Environment 2.54
14	Soc. Crit./ Activism 2.78	Public Service 2.67	Intel./Aesth. Awareness 2.56		Hum./Alt. 2.57	Cul./Aesth. Awareness 2.52	Dem. Gov. 2.49
15	Public Service 2.41	Soc. Crit./ Activism 2.46	Soc. Crit./ Activism 2.48		Soc. Crit. Activism 2.33	Hum./Alt. 2.49	Community 2.37
16	Off-Campus Learning 2.21	Off-Campus Learning 1.88	Cul./Aesth Awareness 2.38		Off-Campus Learning 2.16	Soc. Crit./ Activism 2.26	Soc. Crit./ Activism 2.25
17			Off-Campus Learning 2.03			Off-Campus Learning 1.89	

TABLE 4
RANK ORDER AND MEAN OF GOAL AREA PRIORITIES
BY COLLEGE SYSTEM AND INSTITUTION
FACULTY "SHOULD BE" IMPORTANT

Rank Order	Oakton Community College	California Community Colleges	Seattle Community College	Beaver County Community College	Brevard Community College	Alleghany County Community College	Hillsborough Community College
1	Community 4.44	Community 4.30	Voc. Prep. 4.47	Community 4.59	Community 4.37	Community 4.55	Community 4.48
2	Voc. Prep. 4.25	Voc. Prep. 4.2[illegible]	Community 4.42	Voc. Prep. 4.48	Voc. Prep. 4.36	Voc. Prep. 4.35	Voc. Prep. 4.28
3	Ind. Per. Dev. 4.23	Ind. Per Dev. 4.16	Ind. Per. Dev 4.18	Dem. Gov. 4.30	Dem. Gov. 4.02	Dem. Gov. 4.29	Dem. Gov. 4.23
4	Freedom; Dem. Gov. 4.20	Intel. Orient 4.05	Dem. Gov. 4.08	Ind. Per.Dev. 4.17	Intel. Orient Ind. Per.Dev. 4.00	Ind. Per.Dev. 4.26	Ind. Per. Dev. 4.03
5	Intel. Orient 4.17	Meeting Local Needs 3.98	Soc. Eqal. 4.07	Meeting Local Needs 4.12	Meeting Local Needs 3.93	Intel. Orient 4.12	Intel. Orient. 3.95
6	Innovation 4.09	Dem. Gov. 3.92	Meeting Local Needs 4.05	Intel. Orient 3.97	Innovation 3.74	Meeting Local Needs 4.09	Soc. Eqal. 3.92
7	Meeting Local Needs 3.97	Innovation 3.89	Innovation 3.83	Innovation 3.73	Intel./Aesth. Awareness 3.81	Socl. Eqal. 4.03	Meeting Local Needs 3.91
8	Intel./Aesth. Environment 3.92	Intel./Aesth. Environment 3.[illegible]8	Freedom 3.80	Intel./Aesth Environment 3.72	Academic Dev. 3.74	Innovation 3.98	Freedom 3.88
9	Soc. Egal. 3.89	Soc. Egal. 3.77	Intel./Aesth. Awareness 3.72	Hum./Alt. 3.70	Soc. Egal. 3.63	Freedom 3.95	Innovation 3.84
10	Academic Dev. 3.84	Freedom 3.73	Hum./Alt. 3.67	Public Service 3.58	Freedom 3.57	Intel./Aesth. Environment 3.89	Intel./Aesth. Environment 3.73
11	Hum./Alt. 3.53	Hum./Alt. 3.72	Acc./Effici. 3.57		Hum./Alt. 3.53	Academic Dev. 3.75	Academic Dev. 3.72
12	Acc./Effici. 3.45	Academic Dev. 3.66	Academic Dev. 3.56		Acc./Effici. 3.52	Hum./Alt.; Acc. Effici. 3.65	Public Service; Hum./Alt. 3.62
13	Cul./Aesth. Awareness 3.40	Acc./Effici. 3.46	Public Serv. 3.54		Public Service 3.42	Public Service 3.58	Acc./Effici. 3.52
14	Soc. Crit./ Activism 3.30	Public Service 3.39	Cul./Aesth. Awareness 3.23		Cul./Aesth. Awareness 3.21	Cul./Aesth. Awareness;Soc Crit. Activ. 3.22	Soc. Crit./ Activism 3.31
15	Public Service 3.03	Cul./Aesth Awareness 3.35	Soc. Crit./ Activism 3.19		Soc. Crit./ Activism 2.96	Off-Campus Learning 2.83	Cul./Aesth. Awareness 3.29
16	Off-Campus Learning 2.90	Soc.Crit./ Activism 3.11	Off-Campus Learning 2.87		Off-Campus Learning 2.77		Off-Campus Learning 3.00
17		Off-Campus Learning 2.66					

TABLE 5

RANK ORDER AND MEAN OF GOAL AREA PRIORITIES
BY COLLEGE SYSTEM AND INSTITUTION
ADMINISTRATION "IS" IMPORTANT

Rank Order	Oakton Community College	California Community Colleges	Seattle Community College	Beaver County Community College	Brevard Community College	Alleghany County Community College	Hillsborough Community College
1	Ind. Per.Dev. 3.92	Voc. Prep 3.67	Freedom 3.32	Voc. Prep 3.53	Voc. Prep. 3.59	Voc. Prep 3.43	Voc. Prep 3.54
2	Voc. Prep. 3.83	Meeting Local Needs; Community 3.47	Voc. Prep. 3.05	Meeting Local Needs 3.20	Academic Dev. 3.41	Soc. Egal. 3.30	Academic Dev. 3.43
3	Community; Innovation 3.77	Academic Dev. 3.46	Soc. Egal. 3.00	Ind. Per.Dev. 2.89	Meeting Local Needs 3.40	Meeting Local Needs 3.24	Meeting Local Needs 3.36
4	Freedom 3.62	Soc. Egal. 3.39	Academic Dev. 2.92	Intel. Orient. 2.78	Acc./Effici. 3.28	Freedom 3.17	Soc. Egal 3.29
5	Soc. Egal 3.44	Dem. Gov. 3.35	Acc./Effici. 2.86	Dem. Gov. 2.74	Community 3.24	Academic Dev. 3.13	Innovation 3.18
6	Meeting Local Needs 3.42	Freedom 3.34	Dem. Gov. 2.74	Innovation 2.67	Soc. Egal. 3.18	Acc./Effici. 2.97	Ind. Per. Dev. 3.11
7	Acc./Effici. 3.37	Ind. Per. Dev. 3.32	Community 2.65	Community 2.52	Dem. Gov. 3.10	Dem. Gov. 2.91	Acc./Effici. 3.04
8	Dem. Gov. 3.33	Acc./Effici. 3.25	Metting Local Needs	Public Service 2.41	Intel./Aesth. Environment 2.99	Ind. Per. Dev. Community 2.90	Dem. Gov. 2.96
9	Intel. Orient. 3.27	Intel. Orient. 3.18	Innovation 2.59	Intel./Aesth. Environment 2.32	Innovation 2.98	Intel. Orient. 2.79	Intel. Orient. 2.89
10	Intel./Aesth. Environment 3.21	Innovation 3.16	Ind. Per. Dev 2.50	Hum./Alt. 2.28	Freedom 2.96	Public Service 2.72	Public Service 2.86
11	Cul./Aesth. Awareness 3.11	Intel./Aesth. Environment 3.10	Intel. Orient. 2.48		Intel. Orient. 2.94	Innovation 2.65	Freedom 2.83
12	Academic Dev. 3.06	Hum./Alt. 2.94	Intel./Aesth. Environment 2.43		Ind. Per. Dev. 2.80	Intel./Aesth. Environment 2.61	Intel./Aesth. Env. Off-Campus Learning 2.82
13	Hum./Alt. 2.83	Public Service 2.84	Public Serivce 2.39		Public Service 2.79	Hum./Alt. 2.54	Community 2.79
14	Soc. Crit./ Activism 2.48	Cul./Aesth. Awareness 2.82	Hum./Alt. 2.32		Cul./Aesth. Awareness 2.77	Cul./Aesth. Awareness 2.50	Hum./Alt. 2.57
15	Public Service 2.29	Soc. Crit./ Activism 2.58	Soc. Crit./ Activism 2.24		Hum./Alt. 2.47	Soc. Crit./ Activism 2.19	Soc. Crit./ Activism 2.47
16	Off-Campus Learning 1.92	Off-Campus Learning 1.96	Cul./Aesth. Awareness 2.23		Soc. Crit./ Activism 2.33	Off-Campus Learning 2.03	Cul./Aesth. Awareness 2.43
17			Off-Campus Learning 1.98		Off-Campus Learning 2.13		

TABLE 6

RANK ORDER AND MEANS GOAL AREA PRIORITIES
BY COLLEGE SYSTEM AND INSTITUTION

ADMINISTRATION "SHOULD BE" IMPORTANT

Rank Order	Oakton Community College	California Community Colleges	Seattle Community College	Beaver County Community College	Brevard Community College	Alleghany County Community College	Hillsborough Community College
1	Community 4.44	Voc. Prep. 4.51	Voc. Prep. 4.66	Voc. Prep. 4.56	Voc. Prep. 4.36	Voc. Prep. 4.52	Community 4.39
2	Voc. Prep. 4.32	Community 4.36	Community 4.45	Community 4.36	Community 4.23	Community 4.37	Voc. Prep.; Acc. Effici. 4.14
3	Ind. Per. Dev. 4.08	Ind. Per. Dev. 4.28	Ind. Per. Dev. 4.38	Metting Local Needs 4.23	Meeting Local Needs 4.05	Meeting Local Needs; Acc. Effici. 4.14	Ind. Per. Dev. 4.07
4	Dem. Gov. 4.06	Meeting Local Needs 4.12	Soc. Egal. 4.34	Ind. Per. Dev. 4.15	Ind. Per. Dev 3.97	Ind. Per. Dev. 4.05	Community 4.00
5	Intel. Orient. 3.96	Innovation 4.01	Meeting Local Needs 4.24	Dem. Gov. 4.04	Acc. Effici. 3.95	Soc. Egal. 4.03	Meeting Local Needs 3.89
6	Innovation 3.94	Intel. Orient. 3.99	Intel. Orient. 4.13	Intel. Orient. 3.94	Intel. Orient. 3.91	Intel. Orient. 3.91	Innovation 3.86
7	Meeting Local Needs 3.98	Soc. Egal. 3.98	Innovation 4.09	Innovation 3.74	Innovation 3.84	Dem. Gov. 3.89	Intel./Aesth. Environment 3.75
8	Soc. Egal. Intel./Aesth. Environment 3.77	Dem. Gov. 3.88	Dem. Gov. 4.01	Public Service 3.64	Soc. Egal. 3.79	Innovation 3.85	Intel. Orient. Soc. Egal. 3.68
9	Acc. Effici. 3.70	Intel./Aesth. Environment 3.85	Acc. Effici. 3.87	Intel./Aesth. Environment 3.62	Dem. Gov. 3.76	Intel./Aesth. Environment 3.64	Academic Dev. 3.50
10	Academic Dev. Freedom 3.65	Acc. Effici. 3.83	Intel./Aesth Awareness 3.83	Hum./Alt. 3.28	Intel./Aesth. Awareness 3.73	Academic Dev. 3.61	Freedom 3.46
11	Hum./Alt. 3.19	Hum./Alt. 3.80	Academic Dev. 3.80		Academic Dev. 3.61	Public Service 3.54	Public Service 3.43
12	Cul./Aesth. Awareness 3.04	Academic Dev. 3.63	Hum./Alt. 3.63		Public Service 3.39	Freedom 3.51	Hum./Alt. 3.39
13	Soc. Crit./ Activism 2.67	Freedom 3.59	Public Service 3.59		Hum./Alt. 3.37	Hum./Alt. 3.32	Off-Campus Learning 3.29
14	Public Service 2.60	Public Service 3.50	Freedom 3.58		Freedom 3.16	Off-Campus Learning 2.93	Soc. Crit./ Activism 3.05
15	Off Campus Learning 2.56	Cul./Aesth. Awareness 3.24	Cul./Aesth. Awareness 3.22		Cul./Aesth. Awareness 2.98	Cul./Aesth. Awareness 2.87	Cul./Aesth. Awareness 2.75
16		Soc. Crit./ Activism 3.09	Soc. Crit./ Activism 3.07		Off-Campus Learning 2.80	Soc. Crit./ Activism 2.84	
17		Off-Campus Learning 2.71	Off-Campus Learning 2.96		Soc. Crit./ Activism 2.12		

TABLE 7

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN FACULTY-ADMINISTRATION AT EACH COLLEGE AND SYSTEM TESTED

	Oakton Comm. College	Calif. Comm. Colleges	Alleghany County C.C.	Hillsborough Comm. College	Brevard Comm. College[1]	Seattle Comm. College[1]	Beaver County C.C.[1]
Academic Development - Is Impt.	.09	-.08	.03	-.28	-.18	-.29	------[2]
Should Be Impt.	.07	.01	.07	.08	.06	-.12	------
Intellectual Orientation - Is Impt.	.00	-.09	-.02	-.09	-.06	.05	-.06
Should Be Impt.	.09	.02	.11	.12	.05	-.04	.02
Individual Personal Development - Is Impt.	.05	-.08	.02	-.03	.05	.19	.01
Should Be Impt.	.04	-.04	.11	-.02	.02	-.11	.01
Humanism/Altruism - Is Impt.	.06	-.04	-.02	.02	.04	.11	.01
Should Be Impt.	.11	-.02	.13	.08	.07	.02	.20
Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness - Is Impt.	.12	-.02	.01	.09	.01	.07	------
Should Be Impt.	.11	.03	.14	.20	.10	.00	------
Vocational Preparation - Is Impt.	.04	-.06	-.07	.05	-.05	.23	-.07
Should Be Impt.	-.05	-.09	-.10	.07	.00	-.12	-.05
Meeting Local Needs - Is Impt.	.03	-.05	-.09	-.04	-.07	.22	-.02

	Oakton Comm. College	Calif. Comm. Colleges	Alleghany County C.C.	Hillsborough Comm. College	Brevard Comm. College	Seattle Comm. College	Beaver County C.C.
Public Service - Is Impt.	.04	-.05	-.06	-.02	-.01	.14	.05
Should Be Impt.	.12	-.03	.02	.07	.01	-.02	-.02
Social Egalitarianism - Is Impt.	.04	-.03	-.09	.03	.00	.10	------
Should Be Impt.	.04	-.06	.00	.11	-.07	-.13	------
Social Criticism/ Activism - Is Impt.	.10	-.03	.03	-.10	.00	.11	------
Should Be Impt.	.19	.00	.14	.08	.33	.05	------
Freedom - Is Impt.	.08	-.04	.01	.00	.00	.04	------
Should Be Impt.	.19	.03	.18	.15	.18	.10	------
Democratic Governance - Is Impt.	-.01	-.11	-.11	-.19	-.21	-.02	-.12
Should Be Impt.	.08	.01	.20	.10	.14	.04	.16
Community - Is Impt.	-.07	-.10	-.05	.16	-.22	.06	-.02
Should Be Impt.	.00	-.02	.12	.05	.09	-.02	.17
Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment - Is Impt.	-.00	-.06	-.03	-.13	-.10	.06	.07
Should Be Impt.	.05	.01	.11	-.01	.04	-.06	.06
Innovation - Is Impt.	.03	-.06	.01	.12	-.01	.04	-.01
Should Be Impt.	.06		.07	-.01	-.06	-.15	-.01

	Oakton Comm. College	Calif. Comm. Colleges	Alleghany County C.C.	Hillsborough Comm. College	Brevard Comm. College	Seattle Comm. College	Beaver County C.C.
Off-Campus Learning - Is Impt.	.10	-.02	-.06	-.10	.01	.02	------
Should Be Impt.	.10	-.01	-.03	-.10	-.01	-.03	------
Accountability/Efficiency - Is Impt.	-.03	-.02	-.01	.00	-.10	-.00	------
Should Be Impt.	-.09	-.10	-.23	-.11	-.20	-.14	------

[1] OCC standard deviation used

[2] Data unavailable

- Negative correlation - faculty score is lower than administration score

LARGE TYPE - R_{PB} SIGNIFICANT AT .05

ENDNOTES

[1]The three goal areas not applicable are Traditional Religiousness, Advanced training, and Research.

[2]An institution with several physical plants but one administration and faculty was considered a single institution.

[3]See personal communication from Dr. Thomas W. Smithson, March 3, 1975.

[4]This is not to say that there is consensus within the faculty at any institution or community college system. It merely indicates that the faculty taken as a unit at Oakton is different from or not different from the faculty as a unit at each of the other college systems or individual colleges tested.

[5]Personal communication from Dr. Thomas W. Smithson, n.d.

[6]For an expanded version of the IGI which does include a measure of perceived achievement see Trudy H. Bers, "Goals and Achievements at Oakton Community College: A Study of Faculty and Administration Perceptions" (Oakton Community College, January, 1975), mimeograph.

APPENDIX A

IGI GOAL STATEMENTS GROUPED ACCORDING TO GOAL AREA

Academic Development

1. to help students acquire depth of knowledge in at least one academic discipline . . .

4. to ensure that students acquire a basic knowledge in the humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences . . .

6. to prepare students for advanced academic work, e.g., at a four-year college or graduate or professional school . . .

9. to hold students throughout the institution to high standards of intellectual performance . . .

Intellectual Orientation

2. to train students in methods of scholarly inquiry, scientific research, and/or problem definition and solution . . .

5. to increase the desire and ability of students to undertake self-directed learning . . .

7. to develop students' ability to synthesize knowledge from a variety of sources . . .

10. to instill in students a life-long commitment to learning . . .

Individual Personal Development

3. to help students identify their own personal goals and develop means of achieving them . . .

8. to help students develop a sense of self-worth, self-confidence, and a capacity to have an impact on events . . .

11. to help students achieve deeper levels of self-understanding . . .

13. to help students be open, honest, and trusting in their relationships with others . . .

Humanism/Altruism

14. to encourage students to become conscious of the important moral issues of our time . . .

17. to help students understand and respect people from diverse backgrounds and cultures . . .

20. to encourage students to become committed to working for world peace . . .

21. to encourage students to make concern about the welfare of all mankind a central part of their lives . . .

Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness

15. to increase students' sensitivity to and appreciation of various forms of art and artistic expression . . .

18. to require students to complete some course work in the humanities or arts . . .

21. to encourage students to express themselves artistically, e.g., in music, painting, film-making . . .

24. to acquaint students with forms of artistic or literary expression in non-Western countries . . .

Traditional Religiousness

16. to educate students in a particular religious heritage . . .

19. to help students become aware of the potentialities of a full-time religious vocation . . .

22. to develop students' ability to understand and defend a theological position . . .

25. to help students develop a didication to serving God in everyday life . . .

Vocational Preparation

26. to provide opportunities for students to receive training for specific occupational careers, e.g., accounting, engineering, nursing . . .

30. to develop educational programs geared to new and emerging career fields . . .

36. to provide retraining opportunities for individuals whose job skills have become out of date . . .

38. to assist students in deciding upon a vocational career . . .

Advanced Training

27. to develop what would generally be regarded as a strong and comprehensive graduate school . . .

31. to provide training in one or more of the traditional professions, e.g., law, medicine, architecture . . .

32. to offer graduate programs in such "newer" professions as engineering, education and social work . . .

41. to conduct advanced study in specialized problem areas, e.g., through research institutes, centers, or graduate programs . . .

Research

28. to perform contract research for government, business, or industry . . .

34. to conduct basic research in the natural sciences . . .

35. to conduct basic research in the social sciences . . .

37. to contribute, through research, to the general advancement of knowledge . . .

Meeting Local Needs

29. to provide opportunities for continuing education for adults in the local area, e.g., on a part-time basis . . .

33. to serve as a cultural center in the community served by the campus . . .

39. to provide trained manpower for local-area business, industry, and government . . .

40. to facilitate involvement of students in neighborhood and community-service activities . . .

Public Service

44. to help people from disadvantaged communities acquire knowledge and skills they can use in improving conditions in their own communities . . .

47. to work with governmental agencies in designing new social and environmental programs . . .

50. to focus resources of the institution on the solution of major social and environmental problems . . .

51. to be responsive to regional and national priorities when considering new educational programs for the institution . . .

Social Egalitarianism

42. to provide educational experiences relevant to the evolving interests of women in America . . .

45. to move to or maintain a policy of essentially open admissions, and then to develop meaningful educational experiences for all who are admitted . . .

48. to offer developmental or remedial programs in basic skills (reading, writing, mathematics) . . .

52. to provide educational experiences relevant to the evolving interests of Blacks, Chicanos, and American Indians . . .

Social Criticism/Activism

43. to provide critical evaluations of prevailing practices and values in American society . . .

46. to serve as a source of ideas and recommendations for changing social institutions judged to be unjust or otherwise defective . . .

49. to help students learn how to bring about change in American society . . .

53. to be engaged, as an institution, in working for basic changes in American society . . .

Freedom

54. to ensure that students are not prevented from hearing speakers presenting controversial points of view . . .

57. to ensure the freedom of students and faculty to choose their own life styles (living arrangements, personal appearance, etc.) . . .

60. to place no restrictions on off-campus political activities by faculty or students . . .

63. to protect the right of faculty members to present unpopular or controversial ideas in the classroom . . .

Democratic Governance

55. to create a system of campus governance that is genuinely responsive to the concerns of all people at the institution . . .

58. to develop arrangements by which students, faculty, administrators, and trustees can be significantly involved in campus governance . . .

61. to decentralize decision making on the campus to the greatest extent possible . . .

64. to assure individuals the opportunity to participate or be represented in making any decisions that affect them . . .

Community

56. to maintain a climate in which faculty commitment to the goals and well-being of the institution is as strong as commitment to professional careers . . .

59. to maintain a climate in which communication throughout the organizational structure is open and candid . . .

62. to maintain a campus climate in which differences of opinion can be aired openly and amicably . . .

65. to maintain a climate of mutual trust and respect among students, faculty, and administrators . . .

Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment

66. to create a campus climate in which students spend much of their free time in intellectual and cultural activities . . .

69. to create a climate in which students and faculty may easily come together for informal discussion of ideas and mutual interests . . .

73. to sponsor each year a rich program of cultural events--lectures, concerts, art exhibits, and the like . . .

76. to create an institution known widely as an intellectually exciting and stimulating place . . .

Innovation

67. to build a climate on the campus in which continuous educational innovation is accepted as an institutional way of life . . .

70. to experiment with different methods of evaluating and grading student performance . . .

74. to experiment with new approaches to individualized instruction such as tutorials, flexible scheduling, and students planning their own programs . . .

77. to create procedures by which curricular or instructional innovations may be readily initiated . . .

Off-Campus Learning

68. to encourage students to spend time away from the campus gaining academic credit for such activities as a year of study abroad, in work-study programs in VISTA, etc. . . .

72. to participate in a network of colleges through which students, according to plan, may study on several campuses during their undergraduate years . . .

75. to award the bachelor's and/or associate degree for supervised study done away from the campus, e.g., in extension or tutorial centers, by correspondence, or through field work . . .

78. to award the bachelor's and/or associate degree to some individuals solely on the basis of their performance on an acceptable examination (with no college-supervised study, on-or off-campus, necessary). . .

Accountability/Efficiency

79. to apply cost criteria in deciding among alternative academic and nonacademic programs . . .

81. to regularly provide evidence that the institution is actually achieving its stated goals . . .

83. to be concerned about the efficiency with which college operations are conducted . . .

87. to be accountable to funding sources for the effectiveness of college programs . . .

APPENDIX B

INSTITUTIONAL GOALS INVENTORY SUMMARY

Academic Development- This goal has to do with acquisition of general and specialized knowledge, preparation of students for advanced scholarly study, and maintenance of high intellectual standards on the campus.

Intellectual Orientation- This goal area relates to an attitude about learning and intellectual work. It means familiarity with research and problem-solving methods, the ability to synthesize knowledge from many sources, the capacity for self-directed learning, and a commitment to life-long learning.

Individual Personal Development- This goal area means identification by students of personal goals and the development of means for achieving them, and enhancement of sense of self-worth and self-confidence.

Humanism/Altruism- This goal area reflects a respect for diverse cultures, commitment to working for world peace, consciousness of the important moral issues of the time, and concern about the welfare of man generally.

Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness- This goal area entails a heightened appreciation of a variety of art forms, required study in the humanities or arts, exposure to forms of non-Western are, and encouragement of active student participation in artistic activities.

Vocational Preparation- This goal area means offering: specific occupational curriculums (as in accounting or nursing), programs geared to emerging career fields, opportunities for retraining or upgrading skills, and assistance to students in career planning.

Meeting Local Needs- This goal area is defined as providing for continuing education for adults, serving as a cultural center for the community, providing trained manpower for local employers, and facilitating student involvement in community-service activities.

Public Service- This goal area means working with governmental agencies in social and environmental policy formation, committing institutional resources to the solution of major social and environmental problems, training people from disadvantaged communities, and generally being responsive to regional and national priorities in planning educational programs.

Social Egalitarianism- This goal area has to do with open admissions and meaningful education for all admitted, providing educational experiences relevant to the evolving interests of minority groups and women, and offering remedial work in basic skills.

Social Criticism/Activism- This goal area means providing criticisms of prevailing American values, offering ideas for changing social institutions judged to be defective, helping students learn how to bring about change in American society, and being engaged, as an institution, in working for basic changes in American society.

Freedom- This goal area is defined as protecting the right of faculty to present controversial ideas in the classroom, not preventing students from hearing controversial points of view, placing no restrictions on off-campus political activities by faculty or students, and ensuring faculty and students the freeedom to choose their own life styles.

Democratic Governance- This goal area means decentralized, decision-making arrangements by which students, faculty, administrators, and governing board members can all be significantly involved in campus governance; opportunity for individuals to participate in all decisions affecting them; and governance that is genuinely responsive to the concerns of everyone at the institution.

Community- This goal area is defined as maintaining a climate in which there is faculty commitment to the general welfare of the institution, open and candid communication, open and amicable airing of differences, and mutual trust and respect among students, faculty, and administrators.

Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment- This goal area means a rich program of cultural events, a campus climate that facilitates student free-time involvement in intellectual and cultural activities, and environment in which students and faculty can easily interact informally, and a reputation as an intellectually exciting campus.

Innovation- This goal area is defined as a climate in which continuous innovation is an accepted way of life; it means established procedures for readily initiating curricular or instructional innovations; and, more specifically, it means experimentation with new approaches to individualized instruction and to evaluating and grading student performance.

Off-Campus Learning- This goal area includes time away from the campus in travel, work-study, VISTA work, etc.; study on several campuses during undergraduate programs, awarding degrees for supervised study off the campus; awarding degrees entirely on the basis of performance on an examination.

Accountability/Efficiency- This goal area is defined to include use of cost criteria in deciding among program alternatives, concern for program efficiency, accountability to funding sources for program effectiveness, and regular submission of evidence that the institution is achieving stated goals.

APPENDIX C

COMPARISON BETWEEN OAKTON COMMUNITY COLLEGE FACULTY

AND FACULTY OF EACH COLLEGE SYSTEM OR INSTITUTION SURVEYED

Goal Area	Calif. Comm. Colleges	Alleghany County C.C.	Hillsborough Comm. College	Brevard Comm. College[1]	Seattle Comm. College[1]	Beaver County C.C.[1]
Academic Development - Is Impt.			**	*	**	-----[2]
Should be Impt.	*				*	-----
Intellectual Orientation - Is Impt.	**	**	**	**	**	**
Should be Impt.						
Individual Personal Development - Is Impt.	**	**	**	**	**	**
Should be Impt.						
Humanism/Altruism Is Impt.	*	**	*	**	**	**
Should be Impt.						
Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness - Is Impt.	**	**	**	**	**	-----
Should be Impt.						-----
Vocational Preparation - Is Impt.	*	**		**	**	**
Should be Impt.						
Meeting Local Needs Is Impt.	*	**		*	**	*
Should be Impt.						
Public Service Is Impt.	* -		* -	* -		
Should be Impt.	** -	** -	** -	** -	** -	** -
Social Egalitarianism Is Impt.	**	**		**	*	-----
Should be Impt.				*		-----

APPENDIX C continued

Goal Area	Calif. Comm. Colleges	Alleghany County C.C.	Hillsborough Comm. College	Brevard Comm. College[1]	Seattle Comm. College[1]	Beaver County C.C.[1]
Social Criticism Activism - Is Impt.	**	**	**	**	*	-----
Should be Impt.				*		-----
Freedom - Is Impt.	**	**	**	**	**	-----
Should be Impt.	**			**	**	-----
Democratic Governance Is Impt.	**	**	**	**	**	**
Should be Impt.	**					
Community - Is Impt.	**	**	**	**	**	**
Should be Impt.	*					
Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment - Is Impt.	**	**	**	**	**	**
Should be Impt.						
Innovation - Is Impt.	**	**	*	**	**	**
Should be Impt.	*			**	*	**
Off-Campus Learning Is Impt.	**	*				-----
Should be Impt.	*					-----
Accountability/Efficiency - Is Impt.		*			**	-----
Should be Impt.						-----

* p .05

** p .01

- OCC score is smaller (less important) than institution compared

[1] OCC standard deviation is used as an estimate of the missing standard deviation of the given community college, statistical considerations and partial evidence having indicated that such a procedure would not introduce unreasonable error.

[2] indicates mean score not available

APPENDIX D

COMPARISON BETWEEN OAKTON COMMUNITY COLLEGE ADMINISTRATION

AND ADMINISTRATION OF EACH COLLEGE SYSTEM OR INSTITUTION SURVEYED

Goal Area	Calif. Comm. Colleges	Alleghany County C.C.	Hillsborough Comm. College	Brevard Comm. College[1]	Seattle Comm. College[1]	Beaver County C.C.[1]
Academic Development - Is Impt.	* -					-----[2]
Should be Impt.						-----
Intellectual Orientation - Is Impt.					* -	
Should be Impt.						
Individual Personal Development - Is Impt.	*	**	*	**	**	**
Should be Impt.						
Humanism/Altruism Is Impt.						
Should Be Impt.	* -					
Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness - Is Impt.						-----
Should be Impt.						-----
Vocational Preparation - Is Impt.					*	
Should be Impt.						
Meeting Local Needs Is Impt.						
Should be Impt.						
Public Service Is Impt.	* -			* -		
Should be Impt.	** -	** -	* -	* -	** -	** -
Social Egalitarianism Is Impt.						-----
Should be Impt.					* -	-----

APPENDIX D continued

Goal Area	Calif. Comm. Colleges	Alleghany County C.C.	Hillsborough Comm. College	Brevard Comm. College[1]	Seattle Comm. College[1]	Beaver County C.C.[1]
Social Criticism/ Activism - Is Impt.						-----
Should be Impt.						-----
Freedom - Is Impt.				* -		-----
Should be Impt.						-----
Democratic Governance Is Impt.						
Should be Impt.						
Community - Is Impt.		*	*		**	**
Should be Impt.						
Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment - Is Impt.		*			*	**
Should be Impt.						
Innovation - Is Impt.	**	**		**	**	**
Should be Impt.						
Off-Campus Learning Is Impt.			* -			-----
Should be Impt.						-----
Accountability/Effi- ciency - Is Impt.						-----
Should be Impt.		* -				-----

* p .05

** p .01

- OCC score is smaller (less important) than institution compared

[1] OCC standard deviation is used as an estimate of the missing standard deviation of the given community college, statistical considerations and partial evidence having indicated that such a procedure would not introduce unreasonable error.

[2] indicates mean score not available

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES
AUG 27 1976
CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES